DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 358 228 UD 029 303

TITLE	Shaping America's Future: Proceedings of the National Forum on Restructuring Schools and American Society (New York, New York, February 3, 1989).
INSTITUTION	National Educational Service, Bloomington, IN.
PUB DATE	3 Feb 89
NOTE	34p.; For volumes II and III, see UD 029 304-305.
AVAILABLE FROM	Director of Publications, National Educational Service, 1610 West Third Street, P.O. Box 8, Bloomington, IN 47402.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Children; *Corporate Support; Day Care Centers; *Economically Disadvantaged; *Educationally Disadvantaged; Elementary Secondary Education; Employer Supported Day Care; *Futures (of Society); Higher Education; Long Range Planning; Preschool Education; *Public Policy; School Business Relationship; School Community Relationship; *School Restructuring; Urban Education
IDENTIFIERS	Forums; Reform Efforts

ABSTRACT

Twelve corporate and political leaders met at a forum to discuss educational reform, particularly education for disadvantaged populations and corporate involvement in such reform. Participants opened by discussing issues surrounding on-site child care, during which participants considered the need for these services and the demography of current families and society at large, as well as divisions between suburban versus inner city educational problems and needs. Incentives for and training of teachers for elementary school and secondary school education, the need for significant restructuring of roles in education, the value or lack of value that society places on teachers, and business contributions to higher education are considered. In a discussion of the business community's awareness of the importance of education and good public policy regarding education, participants covered the return on education, the cost of incarceration and welfare services, the emerging role of business in education, the success of local efforts in Chicago (Illinois), and the cultural attachment to a competitive rather than cooperative approach to public life. Other topics include increasing parent participation, programs in Illinois and Minnesota to improve education, and the role of the business community in supporting and shaping educational policy. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED358228

SHAPING AMERICA'S FUTURE

A National Forum on Restructuring Schools and American Society

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

N. R. Shin
National Education Servi

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SHAPING AMERICA'S FUTURE

A National Forum on Restructuring
Schools and American Society

Featuring: Michael Bakalis

Alan Blankstein

W. Edwards Deming

Mary Futrell

Richard Green

Vernon Loucks, Jr.

Richard Miller

Arvin Mueller

Ernest Mueller

Governor Rudy Perpich

John Rosenblum

Michael Usdan

From: The National Educational Service
1821 West Third St., Suite 201
Bloomington, IN 47403
(812)336-7700 or 1-800-73-FORUM

NATIONAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICE FOUNDATION

SHAPING AMERICA'S FUTURE

A National Forum on
Restructuring America's Education system

February 3, 1989

New York Telephone Company's
Corporate Headquarters
New York, New York

PRESENT:

Ernest H. Mueller, Moderator

Richard R. Green

Vernon R. Loucks, Jr.

Michael D. Usdan

W. Edwards Deming

Rudy Perpich

Alan M. Blankstein

Mary Hatwood Futrell

Arvin F. Mueller

Richard D. Miller

John W. Rosenblum

Michael Bakalis

MR. MUELLER: I would like to identify for you our area of focus to develop arenas of collaboration needed to bring about the required changes in our corporate structure. Reform of education is crucial to make certain that the United States continues with its world leadership and survival. Then we will decide on how, through collaboration, these reforms can best be accomplished.

Central to what we do will be our disadvantaged children. We know the problems that they produce for society. We also know that about 80 percent of individuals who are incarcerated are dropouts from education. That gives a decent indicator of the kind of cost that we realize in society for no return. Data suggests that for every dollar we spend for early childhood education, there is a $7.00 return. Most of us would be delighted to get a seven-for-one return on most of our efforts.

Vernon Loucks, where would you and Baxter stand on child care and preschool located at the workplace and in the communities? What if that included a requirement on the part of parents to participate, as well as a community effort on the part of those who are in training to become teachers, and to become leaders in our country?

MR. LOUCKS: Housing a school within the confines of the corporation is something we have to give some thought to. Because we are in a suburb of Chicago, the disadvantaged children which we

seek to address--and the efforts we have been making are really in the inner city. It is a structural, societal problem that we're trying to solve. Parents are travelling long distances to become employed. They are not home when they ought to be at home. They call on social agencies to perform many of the functions that they might otherwise do if they were at home. The child can fall victim to street culture, which interferes with the whole objective of education. You have to address the entirety of circumstance that surrounds the educational problem in a disadvantaged child. In the inner City of Chicago, that has to embrace not only the parents, but it has to embrace the social agencies.

MS. FUTRELL: One of the aspects we have considered supporting has been on-site child care. Perhaps some of you corporate leaders can help with the legislation which is in front of Congress. We have a number of bills which will be considered this year, and if you could help us lobby, then we would be able to provide the affordable quality child care, whether it's on site or whether it is in the community. Whatever arrangements the parents would like to make, they would have access and be able to have some guarantee, some assurance, that their children are not home alone.

Some of these facilities could be in schools; some could be in private organizations, but there are many options which we should consider.

GOVERNOR PERPICH: If you did a survey at any one of your facilities, regardless if they are in the suburbs, you would see that there is a real need. Forty percent or almost 50 percent of your employees will be from single parent families. Obviously,

that parent would want day care facilities, child care facilities on site. You would have to couple that with choice. The child could go to school in the neighborhood where your facility is located, and then right after school could come to the site, where the parent is at, and they could go home together in the evening.

MR. LOUCKS: We don't draw a lot of inner city people out to the suburbs to employ. We draw them more from the farms. The point you are making is that they might come from their community to another community where they may not pay taxes, but have the right to go to school in that community, which is an excellent idea.

MR. MUELLER: 50 percent of the Chicago workers commute out of the city. That gives you some idea about how many children are lacking any kind of adult parental supervision.

GOVERNOR PERPICH: In the vocational institutions in Minnesota, the child can come to school with the parent and they're in the day care facility, and then in the evening they come home together. You could do that at the work site, but the parent also has to have that choice, that option.

MR. ARVIN MUELLER: When we talk about having facilities on site, we have to think far beyond just having a physical plant in order to accommodate those children. It is going to take a much more involved role of the existing schools and of the existing governments. There is another issue that I don't have the answer for and that is whether we are going to intervene or whether we are going to influence the families. I think the issue of intervention may not fly too well.

GOVERNOR PERPICH: Big Brother is not only watching you, he is telling you. He is telling you where your child can go to school, and he's telling you what kind of program that child is going to have, and you can take it or leave it.

MR. USDAN: First of all, it is important to emphasize that child care is no longer just a low-income issue. It is an issue that transcends the economics of the Yuppie-puppies who have acute needs as well as low-income kids.

Secondly, there are statistics that indicate that less than ten percent of a child's time, by the time they reach the age of 18, is spent in school. The non-school factors and environmental impacts on kids are absolutely profound. The thrust of this discussion, in terms of education in the larger society, is very much on target.

Thirdly, the business community needs to get involved politically. We need the help politically. We need it locally. We need it in state capitals. We need it with the federal government, at a time when only 23 percent of the adults now have kids in schools. The constituency for the public school enterprise is vanishing. Increasingly that constituency is economically disadvantaged and minority, and as a result, the schools desperately need the unique political clout that private sector leaders can provide, for Head Start, Child Care, WICK, Chapter 1, this whole cluster of programs that have a very successful track record.

MR. MILLER: We need to recognize that education is being delivered on two different playing fields in America. You have the

large urban schools that have unique problems and the youngsters that they're attempting to serve and the collaboration with social services that are available in those types of situations.

The other playing field, is the urban-suburban playing field, under which a lot of school youngsters are having their needs met. These schools were the basis for the Carnegie Report, or a Nation at Risk, one of those report on good delivery systems, that need improvement

The whole issue boils down to the pockets of poverty that America has allowed to exist. When you calculate that only about 16 percent of the youngsters who are eligible for Head Start are being served, and only about 40 percent of the youngsters in terms of Chapter One Compensatory Education Programs are being served, you have a vast area of youngsters who are in this at-risk pool, that need to have some kinds of resources provided for them so they have an opportunity to just play even with the suburban youngsters, or with the typical home where you have two parents at home, even though they're working. We are all aware of the fact that two-thirds of the workers in the 90's will be minorities or women, or two-thirds of the women will be working, and that is going to perpetuate the problem.

There is a whole area of at-risk youngsters, we need to look at, and those are the youngsters who are involved in the teen pregnancies. And in many places across America we still address education in kind of a two-by-four curriculum: the contents between two covers of a textbook and four walls of a classroom. We need to break out of that style and do some of those things that will

improve the educational process for this quality or this youngster who has that distinct need.

MR. MUELLER: Dr. Bakalis, with you vantage point in higher education, what kinds of efforts are those schools which are training our teachers, putting forth to overcome the difficulty that we are experiencing with respect to teaching disadvantaged youth? Do you see them supporting a community or service requirement?

DR. BAKALIS: The training is really not the kind of inter-disciplinary training which an individual ought to have in terms of psychology, sociology, history, economics, all of those kinds of things which go into understanding an inner school urban setting. So the training is very far behind the reality. The reward system is not there.

We're talking about whether the structure of teacher training today is appropriate to a mass educational system. I think we are in need of a redefinition institutionally of what everybody's role is.

DR. GREEN: Let me suggest that a major problem that I am confronted with is a lack of teachers coming into the marketplace. How do we grow new teachers? How do we attract new people? Regardless of what the structure is, regardless of what the game rules are, regardless of whether it is a merit system or a non-merit system, how do we get people who will sit in the classrooms of this country's schools, to do the job of education for the next 20 or 30 years? Some action plan to get at how we bring people into that position is probably going to be the most serious problem

facing America. What should we do as a result of the discussion here today and where do we take that to tomorrow?

DR. BAKALIS: I think we know a great deal about what motivates people in terms of doing the job and doing the job well. When you start listing those things, teaching has virtually none of them. It is not only money, it is status, prestige, sense of accomplishment, a sense of being respected by other people, a sense of control over your own destiny, some kind of involvement over where you are going; all of those things that we know motivate people are not part of teaching today.

Given the life style and environment of many young people today, they are just not going to go into it, unless we address those kind of issues. Money is important, but I have always contended that if we started all teachers tomorrow at $35,000 a year right out of college, you would still have the same problems. Frankly; five years, six years, ten years down the line they would still start leaving because those other kinds of rewards are not built into the structure at all.

MR. BLANKSTEIN: The teaching profession and education in general doesn't get its fair shake in terms of the value that is placed on it by society.

MR. LOUCKS: My perspective on the business dialogue that needs to exist in order to support the effort going forward here is that it does not exist. Business is preoccupied with what's wrong and isn't very quick to recognize what's right about the proposals which are coming forward. Business is impatient, which is one of the more critical issues I think we have to face. You can't snap

your fingers and turn this thing around. There has to be a dialogue so that you get at the fact base of what is causing this thing. We're dealing with symptoms and most of the efforts, are being placed after the dropouts have occurred.

MR. MUELLER: Your comments, about the treatment of the symptoms and the impatience of the corporations is indicative in their support position, with respect to how they financed education: 1.8 billion, as I understand it, going towards higher ed, college efforts; and about 200 million to precollege efforts. How can business close their eyes to the tremendous amount of money they are spending in the area of welfare, in the area of incarceration, in the area of retraining? They are spending more money in those areas than the total that they are contributing to higher education.

MR. USDAN: The challenge is to sustain this involvement and clone the Brad Butlers, Bill Woodsides and a handful of others who have been interested in these issues.

MS. FUTRELL: Much of the leadership from the business community is discovering that there are no dispensable children in America. In the past we could look at certain groups and say, "Well, if we educate these children, well, that's fine, and we don't have to worry about others." We are trying to say to people you have to pay attention to the children of America from the time they are conceived, onward. And the formative years are extremely important. What happens during those years, to a large degree, will determine what will happen once they get in school and whether

or not they will be successful.

We shouldn't simply be concerned about the children of working parents. We have to be concerned about all children. So, whether those parents work or not, let's provide those children with an opportunity to have child care as well. We have to start before those children ever enter school, and then maintain that support all the way through.

We also know that the statistics will show us when we have children who are receiving that kind of help, the parents are much more productive because they are not worrying about what is happening with their children. They know they are safe. The business community has a vested interest in working not only with schools, but working with parents and working with other agencies in the community to make sure those young people get a good education.

DR. ROSENBLUM: One of the critical educational challenges, is educating a business elite about the issues and evolutions. I have been with executives and aspiring managers and people who teach those aspiring managers, and their level of insight I think is inadequate. If you don't share a sense of the urgency and the criticality of the problems, you don't really then take the next step and buy into the kind of hard choices, whether it is lobbying or corporate choices that have to be made.

MR. ARVIN MUELLER: There is certainly a growing awareness that probably doesn't run very deep. But leadership is required to develop the methods of collaboration. I don't think there is a reluctance to support and fund initiatives and processes to improve

the situation, but we need to develop a way to do that. It may very well vary from Detroit to Oklahoma City to San Francisco. Those may be entirely different situations from town to town, but we need to develop some kind of a way to support the composite structure.

MR. RICHARD MILLER: Business has really taken a bigger role in the educational process. A classic example of that is last year, when Bennet presented a $12 billion education budget and they had five CEO's, that testified before the appropriations committee. We ended up with a $19 billion dollars. Now, that had never happened before.

MR. USDAN: If you look at the share of support for public education that comes from the business community, it is probably less than PTA Bake Sales. The public tax base has to support public education. I think that one of the most misleading and dangerous notions is that somehow or other you can turn to the business community for any kind of significant contributions, in terms of the kind of investment that has to be made in the public school infrastructure and human service infrastructure in the years ahead.

GOVERNOR PERPICH: The last four or five years very obviously business has become much more active and more of a partner, but it also has created many of the problems. In many states, of course, the business community is the one that leads the attack whenever monies are necessary to fund good programs. I think that they should really take a look at what direction is that local school board or local political subdivision or the state is going and are the dollars really focused on education. I think that business has

to do an evaluation of what to support and the cost necessary for safe, early childhood or child care facilities.

Secondly, they have to become more of a partner in this whole effort. We could use their expertise as far as management - you know principals and teachers don't have management courses. It has to be a partnership. However, if you are going to have child care facilities and you are going to go into Head Start programs like we have in Minnesota, I have to have a $15 million increase in the budget to just take up the slack in Head Start because the Feds have dropped off. It's a good program, it's a winner, so we have to take up that slack. But, if I am getting pounded on the outside, I am going to lose.

I am very fortunate in Minnesota that I have a good business community that supports that. The political effort has to be right across the board.

MR. MUELLER: When we did this program out in Chicago a year ago, one of the very first statements made to me by the corporate community was, "Don't ask us for any more money." I said, "While we would love all the money you can give us, we are much more interested in what you can do with respect to dissemination of information, support for our local boards from your corporate leaders, as well as your political and legislative clout. We want that." More than 460 people attended that meeting, interested in seeing what we could do. We got it off the ground. Now we have to come back and hit it again.

DR. BAKALIS: Illinois is now 44th in the country in terms of

funding education. It's the biggest disgrace of my lifetime. The Illinois Manufacturers Association was the major opponent of any kind of funding increases. The short-term view of business is something that I think has to change. It's got to be a long-term view of where we are going over the next ten, 15, 20 years, whether it is the state or the nation. And that costs some money. Money is not the only answer.

MR. MUELLER: Perhaps the long-term focus is beginning to set in. Folks are beginning to say, "Wait a minute, we know we are getting immediate gratification by throwing money at scholarships, but those are the folks who have gone through the system already and have succeeded. We are still paying the tab for those who are not going to make it in the system on a continuous basis. Maybe we had better reorient our thinking and get some money focused in at those votes."

MR. ARVIN MUELLER: I think we could still put money on elementary education and not get very much for it. The issue isn't put the money in, it's the apprehension of putting money in for nothing. If we are going to put money into something, we have to put it into a system. We need to define what that system is into which the money goes. That's what we are struggling with here.

MS. FUTRELL: We not only define the system, we have to look at the people who are being served by that system.

MR. LOUCKS: The Illinois Manufacturers represents all manufacturing in the State of Illinois. Their position represented small, downstate business who resented increased taxes going to the City of Chicago problems which was not well defined as a system.

That was the resistance. Most of the large businesses in the state separated themselves from the Illinois Manufacturers on that situation. At the root of the Illinois State problem is the problem of disadvantaged children in the inner cities. If you don't focus on that, you are constantly going to be beleaguered across the entire spectrum of the population of the state.

MR. USDAN: People have to realize though that there is a remarkable ripple effect on public education that stems out of the media attention on the problems in the inner city. You can have 500 schools functioning magnificently. If there is trouble in one school and your 10:00 p.m. or 11:00 p.m. news will be on that particular school. The only thing the public basically perceives is an enterprise in total and constant chaos. I would argue that it impacts negatively on suburban schools and really the whole public school enterprise, which I think is in danger of losing its middle class. It's a class issue, infinitely more than a racial or an ethnic or any other kind.

MS. FUTRELL: All disadvantaged, all at-risk children are not in the inner city. They are in our most affluent communities. They are in our rural communities, and we can't forget them.

MR. DEMING: The same evils that have brought our economy to destruction also afflict and affect education. Our system of rewards has ruined both. The so-called merit system, which grew out of rugged individualism, which was good around 1850, maybe, and has been outmoded for decades is the same evil that has afflicted education. Our evils will continue until we change course from rugged individualism, "I win, you lose," to cooperation, everybody

wins--and I mean everybody--by cooperation. I mean elimination of the merit system.

You know where we are at? Our exports, our deficit; the manufactured goods have been growing worse for 20 years. The bank balance looks a little better. They have natural resources to sell off. The Masabe Range in 1910 delivered 73 and 74 percent iron, today 33 percent. We fished it out, non-renewable. Selling off real estate. The bank balance shows not as bad. The bank balance is not as bad as our situation would indicate we're at. Forty four percent of the office space in Los Angeles is owned by Japanese; twenty-three percent in Washington, non-renewable. We have been living on fat.

Rugged individualism, our system of reward, so-called merit system, is a destroyer of people. It destroyed our economy, destroyed our schools. Nothing will be possible, though improved it will not be possible, until we get at the causes. The same evils afflict business as afflict education.

System of management are in place in the western world that for survival must be blasted out, new construction commenced, patch work will not suffice. It is necessary that management shift the focus to management's responsibility for the source of quality and service, design of product and of the process that turn out the product.

First of all, we have to educate ourselves on what we ought to do. Try to understand, I believe, the basic cause of our trouble. Our economy has leveled off, patch work will not take care of it, will not be effective. We are late. We need a transformation, and

I mean change of state. Just as water changes state when it freezes, there needs to be a transformation for business and government to cooperate in win-win. That will automatically bring joy to work; it will automatically bring joy to learning, and joy to teaching; joy in work, man is entitled to it, I believe.

Can you imagine what percentage of people in industry take joy in their work? Maybe two in a hundred. On the factory floor, it's probably ten or twelve. Man is entitled to joy in work. Children are entitled to joy in learning. Instead of being demoralized right from the start by grades, on up through the university graded, made to feel inferior, humiliated, can't make it, they make it in the jail. They make trouble, and we all pay.

MR. USDAN: If we are going to logically look at child care and these kind of extra school effects on what happens to children, it seems to me that we will have to look at the governance issue just beyond the schools, and we have to reassess the basic structure of schools: the relationship of schools to general government in the cities and in the suburbs. If, indeed, you have to provide comprehensive services, medical services, social services, education services, and so forth, the traditional split and separation of school governance from general governance has to be dramatically reassessed in the cities. The old rationale 40 or 50 years ago, in terms of municipal reform, is no longer applicable in terms of the crisis that afflicts the cities.

MS. FUTRELL: What we have to present is a vision and then individual state school districts have to define themselves what is meant by reform, what is meant by restructuring, based on the needs

of those particular communities. What we are saying is more work to change the schools; let's restructure, let's reform the schools. Admittedly, we can't do it alone. We don't have all the ideas. What we are proposing is to work with the administrators. Richard Miller's group, will be working with us. We will reach out to the business community; we will reach out to parents because we do have to have a collaborative effort.

How do we do a better job of educating all the children in this country, and do it so that they really thoroughly enjoy learning and they get a good education?

DR. ROSENBLUM: "Transformation," strikes me as the provocative word. If we are talking about transformational change, not of program, not of content, then we are calling for transformational leadership, which is of an order of leadership in government, it seems to me, that is in scarce supply. We are talking about a diagnosis that says incremental change; evolution isn't going to get us there, transformation is what is needed. Those are very important conclusions, if one goes back and thinks about the institutions that we try to live within and manage within.

MR. MUELLER: Yes, as the Dean from the school at M.I.T. commented, we have some fine students, but we have a tail end, that most industrial nations do not have, an uneducated group. And we, as Vanoker put it, have allowed the future to slip out of our hands. I don't know that it's gone. Dr. Deming has made some strong statements that it is disappearing rapidly. Unless we can alter this, I think he is right, it is going to be gone.

MR. BLANKSTEIN: We are calling for a consolidated base of information and means for exchanging information. For example, corporations that have advanced to a different method of leadership than was used back when the schools were modeled after them, may at this point want to institute some means by which they can share cutting-edge information about what works. What's working in terms of leadership? What's working in terms of team work?

Another channel for exchange of information may be consolidating information about all of the schools that are effective, and disseminating it so that others can model after the effective aspects of those schools.

DR. BAKALIS: I think the first step is to plan what you want to do. I'm sure that there are good schools, obviously, thousands of them in the country. I am troubled by what do you want people to be. Less than 50 percent turn out to vote. Are we training for citizenship? If we are training for citizenship, we have failed. Are we training for humanity? Are we training for economic competence? If you are going to sort out what institutions should do what and how you eliminate fragmentation, I think you have to decide what you want to do. Then you say, this is how we now have to transform the institutions of society, to fit into that picture of what we want to do. I am not so sure we know what we want to do.

We measure success by the percentage of kids who graduate from high school. I don't think that that's a great measure of success if they don't know who they are voting for, if they can't determine Florida from California, if they think that Lincoln came after

Lyndon Johnson.

MR. ARVIN MUELLER: If you want to talk about creating something here, certainly money is involved, but mostly it is the involvement and the influence of the three elements of the society, government, industry and education, that are going to make this happen. If we want to describe the surrogate environment, we should set about describing what that might look like; or set about getting some people who know what those elements are, working on that.

MR. LOUCKS: Professor Deming's point of joy, is exactly the word we used that started our corporate school. The corporate school is a creation of a group of Chicago business people. And it is an effort, really to try to test many of the concepts we have been discussing here today which involves the effectiveness of teachers, the random selection of students and the focus on the pre-school period. Cardinal Burndine, a school which was no longer used by the Catholic system was donated to us at a reasonable lease price. The school opened this fall. The students have been selected by lottery from North Lawndale, which is a very disadvantaged section of the City of Chicago. We are starting at age two. Our eventual intention is to go up through the eigth grade, and to recognize that it is important to capture children's interest productively before the street culture captures them. That involves not only the teaching and the administrative mechanism of the school, but also the parents.

It involves also the social agencies, which are the adults significant others, who need to be involved in order to make sure

that this student has alternatives, that the hand-offs in the morning from the parents to the school are accommodated, and that it is accommodated by a 7:00 to 7:00 day and by a school year which runs fully eleven months of the year. The issue at the corporate school is not of this love relationship that exists between the teaching staff and the principal, it is also an involvement of the parents, an involvement of the social agencies in the area, and an involvement of the business community. What we really bring to it is financial, principally. The educational process, if joy is the underlying symbol and you have people who are able to foster that, doesn't need interference from bureaucrats like me. It needs the opportunity to flower and to allow the children to express themselves in a way which is productive and which allows them to learn and become a part of society.

There has to be some guidance and some structure, and the teaching staff and the principal provides that, as do the parents and social agencies. Everybody says, "Yeah, but it is throwing pebbles in the ocean. But my response to that is you don't swallow elephants in one bite. First you eat the fleas then you eat it a bite at a time. It is, intended to be a laboratory, not a model--there have been lots of models, where you can look in and you can see what it takes. It is the whole concept of what it takes a child to become vital, to feel vital. We all know, there is a certain transformation that needs to occur in this country, but it needs a laboratory.

MR. MUELLER: Apropos the surrogate aspect in that corporate school, one of the prerequisite was the parent would commit

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

themselves to participation in that program.

MR. LOUCKS: We have parents educational programs at the school.

MR. MUELLER: Most parents, if they have an opportunity, will take on involvement with gusto. It is where there are no parents, where there is no adult at all, that we need to provide access to adult supervision and direction and support.

Surrogate is a part of that. Getting those parents involved, which Vernon is doing and that corporate community school is doing in Chicago is an essential ingredient because many of those parents are frightened to death about getting involved in the school. Their experience in schools was so devastating, they don't want to go back. How do you give those folks the desire to be part of an establishment such as a school which was so tough on them? That is why involvement in that corporate community school by a parent is so essential an element.

GOVERNOR PERPICH: The first important step is to have the child care facilities and programs available on site, on the job. Some school districts have an extended day. Those that don't, that would be a natural for the private sector.

MR. MUELLER: If we are going to have child care and early childhood education, that can't be limited to on site. It has to have a broader base than that, because there are many people who aren't in that workplace who absolutely need that effort. Governor, your legislators are going to have to standup and bite that bullet, as well as the rest of the community and provide child care and early childhood education in all communities, as well as

at the workplace.

That is something for us to work on, if we can agree that this is something that we ought to be doing.

DR. GREEN: The schools have a very special role to play when it comes to the disadvantaged. The schools may be the only place that offers what we call "safe haven". Indeed the schools may, for the first time, be operating in local parents. The notion that you would, therefore, have to measure a school by parent involvement, may render many schools in America, powerless, to be perceived as institutions of the future.

While we want strong parent involvement, while we expect strong parent involvement, the fact is there are large numbers of students in America that will not have parent involvement, and so the school is the only substitute that is out there. I want to be very careful in stating our position. We need to value at a much higher level the role of institutions as we bridge to the next century. Now those who are concerned about socialism in America will not accept this argument.

I know that we have very high standards for parents in American and ought to. But we ought to have a higher standard for children, which is whether they have supportive parents or educated parents or any parents, that we will care for those children.

DR. ROSENBLUM: Transformations take place in lots of little steps, lots of early wins. We have got to face questions of territorial boundaries within the university and talk to each other, rather than try to address the problem school by school. We have got to talk to our graduate and undergraduate students and

impress upon them that this is a responsibility they have as future business managers, to think about now, to get involved in now. Whether it is part of their educational career, whether it is part of their early business career, it has got to be early in their emotional and professional development, not left to when they sit in the CEO's chair and come to this issue, often for the first time.

MR. ARVIN MUELLER: I think that part of the "how" here is how do we reach these three elements of this system on a broad base? Not all the first day, but to have a process put in place that is going to spread out. Because it's people we're talking about and the kids we are talking about are in every small town in the United States.

MR. LOUCKS: That's the way we got the corporate school started, by going to a few others that sparked the idea and who have since made others follow. The mechanisms are not easy ones because business, like every other situation, has its bureaucratic elements to it, and it tends to be rather confined to the way it has always done things, and you have to somehow break through that sort of veneer to get the message across.

This is an attempt to set up a laboratory, something which proves certain concepts which have been articulated here and many of which have been articulated before. It is an effort to have the rubber meet the road. The way to get at it is not to throw a great big shotgun pattern at the wall and try to hit it all at once. We think it is a useful mechanism which, if it can be replicated, can be expanded out through the school system at large.

Not necessarily the way it is drawn up today, but in some other manner. It at least sparks people intuitive interest and sparks their creative activity perhaps to do something meaningful, but to do something.

The only thing the corporations have done, is to provide a certain amount of management guidance and funding. I am talking about corporations, not just our own, but United Airlines, Quaker Oats Company, Sears Robuck, Commonwealth Edison, Borg Warner. They are trying to express not only their discomfort with the results of the school system, but trying to do something about it rather than saying, "Look, it's a bad deal and let's throw money at it."

I really believe there are many places--Rudy has done a great job in Minnesota--we have begun to scratch the surface in Illinois; it is happening in some other places with business, but it is the plant--to--seed theory that has to go forward here.

GOVERNOR PERPICH: With the Education Commission of the States, which of course is made up of the governors and legislators and educators, we recognized that the missing link was the business community, and this year we have invited them. Each governor is going to appoint one CEO to a committee. Jack McAlyster, the CEO of U.S. West co-chaired it with me. Our first effort is going to be urban schools. What we need is a recognition on the part of governors and legislators and people in the educational establishment that the corporate world is a very important part of attempting to resolve the problems that are recognized in education. There is that recognition in Minnesota. For a number of years now we have had what we call a business partnership, and

they have been very helpful with our efforts. We wouldn't be where we are today if it wasn't for the corporate effort in Minnesota. We, of course, have been fortunate that we have a lot of the home grown corporate heads who reside there and have ownership in the educational system.

MR. MUELLER: I have a tremendous concern about corporate/business partnerships. I have noticed that while they have the best intent, and do produce some fine outcomes, the focus is always on those who are going to make it, almost invariably, even though there is some effort down on the lower hand to help children who are disenfranchised.

One of the things that it does, unfortunately, is it says often to the business people, "We have fulfilled our obligation because we send someone into the workplace of the schools once a week to tutor children and do nice things," That ain't enough. We need to make certain that the corporate folks recognize that we aren't going to make it without them, or with only that kind of an effort. It has got to be grander than that.

GOVERNOR PERPICH: Let me respond to that also. They did an in-depth study of the schools in Minnesota, and after the study was completed, the head of 3-M got into an airplane with me and we really barnstormed the state. We hit every media center. There was a major effort. They never gave up. It was constant. It is not only just giving a report and saying, "Here it is folks," with one news conference and then walking away from it. They have kept it up to this day, and it's been four years. They were on that airplane. They were at those media centers and they bought ads in

newspapers and on radio. As a result, I think we made a lot of progress.

MR. LOUCKS: I am trying to think, of how we do that in the State of Illinois. One of the things that you have done is you have not separated the need at the pre-school, early school level from the top. One of the difficulties we have is everyone wants to plug the high school level, which is really dealing with symptoms.

MS. FUTRELL: I would like to caution us not to forget about two groups of people who tend to be overlooked when we talk about educational reform. We tend often times to create commissions and task forces and come forth in good spirit, and we forget the teachers and we forget the parents. They are the ones that are going to be responsible for recommending those reforms, especially in the schools and getting the support from the parents to help motivate the children to provide that basic support. As we build that coalition, I hope it is a coalition of mobility and not a coalition of immobility, meaning that we do all these grand things and then nothing happens in the schools themselves.

If we want something to happen in the schools, then we have to involve the people in the schools who will be responsible for moving that agenda forward.

MR. MILLER: I believe, with the corporate world, that one of the things that must happen in the future is that the corporate leadership must disseminate down through its lower structure a greater involvement of the managerial people in operation of the schools, vis-a-vis serving on boards of education.

DR. BAKALIS: Isn't the question, what is the model that you

need to create? If it's not the business model, certainly not, say, the university model where you get total paralysis of inaction. What is the model?

MR. MILLER: As a school administrator in a school community, there were constantly people who would say, "You ought to run your schools the way we run business," we don't let them sit idle. There was a band instrument company --the President was a friend of mine--and I said, "Bill, when you decide to start the manufacture of a saxophone, you specify what kinds of materials you want to work with." There isn't a school or a public school in the country that defines what the specifications of the materials of those kids who enter. And then you take them into an environment; you keep your material there. You constantly check for any variance. I am sure if you have a door panel on a Chevrolet that's out at a variance of whatever, a thousandths of an inch, it is rejected and goes back into scrap. I asked him if he sent the saxophone home with the workers at night so that they could set them on the porch with all kinds of elements, or the kids could kick them around the room. That doesn't happen with the manufacturing community, but it happens with some of our kids in America's schools today, either verbally or physically. You can't compare that model because we take every youngster who comes.

MR. BLANKSTEIN: It became clear that having corporate and community organizations provide or play a surrogate role for children who are disadvantaged is an important area to explore. We spoke of doing that in terms of having on-site facilities made available to disadvantaged children. "On-site" meaning on the

corporate site, or in the community.

MR. USDAN: A number of school systems have begun to open up options for parents, for kids to attend school near where the parent works. I know Prince Georges County in Maryland is doing this, and this is a very positive movement, more options, more choice. Again, this is a lot of very plus time for working parents. They drive their kids to school and work nearby, that's good, quality time going to and from work. That's another one of these options that ought to be built into the discussion.

DR. GREEN: If the theory of this conference is shaping educational policy for the future, one had better examine all of the implications of providing choice and what the residue is for those that are left behind. It will mean that large numbers of children in urban communities will never be in the corporate classroom. It also means that they will not experience the work ethic. I support the concept, so don't get me wrong, but the notion of the public mission is one of inclusion, it is not one of exclusion.

If choice leads to exclusion, we around this table need to be very careful about what we are willing to allocate.

MR. MUELLER: There was never an intent to make the corporate opportunity a singular opportunity. We combine that with a community opportunity. We wanted this open to the broad spectrum of all children. But we could give this other opportunity to folks who are traveling to work places

MR. BLANKSTEIN: One of the things that I feel deeply about, is leveling the playing ground. I think that that is what this is

supposed to address, in part, and that is why we mentioned the community organizations, and that is why the whole idea of having some surrogate foundation in place is so necessary.

Another point that we had spoken of was that corporate CEO's and leaders in the corporations should make an attempt to build awareness throughout the organization about the needs of the disadvantaged children, and the need for their participation in a positive way in the support of education. Students in schools of business and education, and any other higher education disciplines must be sensitized to these issues. They must become involved with the process of improving the quality of life for disadvantaged children. John Rosenblum has stated that he will begin that process back at the Darden School.

Everyone here is going to leave with the intent of getting another colleague from your respective field involved, both at your local site, and involved in coming back to the table for another round of discussions, and for an opportunity to build on what we have done today.

There was call for, and I think a positive response to, the idea of business leaders lending their political clout to supporting education.

We are not talking about incremental changes; it seemed that we were all in agreement that we have to review the entire process and system.

MR. USDAN: When you are talking abut an enterprise as pluralistic as American public education, with 15,000 plus school systems and 97,000 school board members, et cetera, reform and

change is going to be kind of a kaleidoscope of top-down and bottom-up and community-out and local-district-down. It is just going to be a very fluid and dynamic kind of process that has to get its energy from really local circumstances. There has been a lot of dysfunctional discussion and debate about bottom-up and top-down, as if they are absolutely antithetical, which is not the case. It is a much more dynamic, fluid thing.

DR. GREEN: We may be the first generation that understand that we are in a period of transformation and we have a chance to manage it. How we use our intelligence collectively is going to be the central force. We have a sense that change needs to take place and it needs to be managed in a way that it benefits the common good. We often are paralyzed by inaction, high levels of discussion, potential outcomes, when in fact we feel like Nero fiddling while Rome is burning. The people in this room who are part of small networks all over this country have the potential for managing this change. I don't understand, or at least I don't accept, that we can't transform the schools of this nation in order to insure our future. I am convinced that if we don't move to the action phase or if we continue to be divided by corporate, public, private, surrogate mentor inner city and all the other issues that are there, that it is our own fault.

We are intelligent enough, we have enough history, we have enough experience to move into schools and do that. What I think the test of our capacity at this moment is, do we have the courage? And the question has nothing to do with structure; it has nothing to do with who is in control; it has nothing to do with governance.

It has to do with will a collective people believe it is important enough to manage change and have the courage to step forward and do it? The flood gates are wide open. There is no one who has a leg up on this business. Certainly, in my profession as Chancellor of the New York schools, I know there's a million children and a hundred thousand employees. 61,000 of them are teachers, who are depending on someone having the courage to step us and get this job done, and they are willing to make it happen.

I hope that we will market intelligence in managing this period of transformation. I would argue that I don't think we have that much time. Someone has to assume the mantle of leadership to simply get it done in their universe, and then make sure that they share that universe with others, so that either it can be replicated or will drive the next universe to be better or to do better.

MR. MUELLER: There are two facets toward what we have attempted to do here, and those continue to come back to haunt us: One is identifying that which we can agree on, getting to consensus. And the second part is, how do we make it work?

DR. GREEN: Corporate America is now looking with great interest at the development of families in America. America is changing to a darker and different nation that has a tremendous bilingual population that is going to be available. If the transformation is going to be an effective transformation, business is going to have to be sensitive and nurture and celebrate those differences. The fact that business is having this discussion today is a very important signal.